

asking an appropriation for deepening the harbor at Savannah, Ga.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: Papers to accompany bill granting increase of pension to William Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKETT: Papers to accompany bill to pension William McBrien—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to pension Victor Vifquain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of the board of directors of the Nebraska Lumber Dealers' Association, favoring enlargement of power of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURNETT: Petition of John Edwards, of Dekalb County, Ala., praying reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CANNON: Memorial of business men of Ogden, Utah, praying for legislation to correct unjust discrimination in railroad freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of W. L. Grosse and others, of Cissna Park, Ill., protesting against passage of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of J. F. Austin & Son, of Georgetown, Ill., protesting against passage of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of the board of directors of the Commercial Club, of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for legislation to correct unjust discriminations in freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the insurance commissioner of Illinois, asking legislation for the suppression of fraudulent insurance companies—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASSINGHAM: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 2051) granting increase of pension to Joseph Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolution of Local Union No. 132, Brooklyn, N. Y., of Cigar Makers' International Union, protesting against passage of Cuban reciprocity bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the executive committee of the National German-American Alliance, against the passage of the so-called Hepburn bill in relation to interstate liquor traffic—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of select common council of Philadelphia, relative to a 35-foot channel for the Delaware River, port of Philadelphia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GRAFF: Petition of business men of Delavan, Ill., protesting against passage of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Papers to accompany bill to pension Rachel A. Woodmansee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to increase the pension of William M. Neal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: Papers to accompany bill to increase pension of Jason H. Masterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: Papers to accompany bill to pension Henry E. Buckingham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to pension Emily Conklin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to increase pension of Edward T. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, Senate Report No. 439; Mr. GALLINGER, from Committee on Naval Affairs, relative to the appointment of Allen V. Reed—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of R. E. Bowles and 14 other business men of Creston, Ill., protesting against the passage of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Resolution of the R. D. Lathrop Post, No. 138, Grand Army of the Republic, of Hudson, Department of New York, favoring passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNAPP: Papers to accompany bill granting increase of pension to C. E. Mink—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Mexico, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LITTAUER: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Daniel Mosher—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCCREARY of Pennsylvania: Resolutions of the Philadelphia Produce Exchange, Pennsylvania Shoe Manufacturers' Association, Trades League of Philadelphia, Travelers' Protective Association of Philadelphia, select and common councils of Philadelphia, and Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, relative to a

35-foot channel for the Delaware River, port of Philadelphia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MACON: Papers to accompany bill to pension William Y. M. Wilkerson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REEDER: Resolution of Baxter Post, No. 123, Grand Army of the Republic, Baxter Springs, Kans., in favor of the passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: Papers to accompany bill to make Alexandria, Va., a port of immediate transportation—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of Cigar Makers' Union No. 37, of Fort Wayne, Ind., protesting against passage of the Cuban reciprocity bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN: Papers to accompany H. R. 4661, for the relief of John Brill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of Rosell Austin and others, of Frankfort, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: Papers to accompany bill to remove charge of desertion from the record of the late J. W. Culver—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPALDING: Petition of merchants of Grafton, N. Dak., protesting against the passage of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of the Commercial Club, of Fargo, N. Dak., favoring the appointment of a permanent tariff commission—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Joseph L. Croskrey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WADE: Resolution of the Davenport, Iowa, Turngemeinde, protesting against the passage of the Hepburn bill, restricting interstate liquor traffic—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Petition of Douglas Wilson, of Towanda, Pa., claiming pay for labor as ambulance driver and hostler during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WYNN: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 2862) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta A. Pryce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, November 25, 1903.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. F. J. PRETTYMAN.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary read the following communication:

PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE, UNITED STATES SENATE,
November 25, 1903.

To the honorable Senate of the United States:

I hereby appoint JOHN KEAN, Senator from New Jersey, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WM. P. FRYE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. KEAN thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer, and directed the Secretary to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. BEVERIDGE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Journal will stand approved, without objection.

GEORGE S. THEBO, JR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of George S. Thebo, jr., executor of George S. Thebo, deceased, v. The United States; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

FRENCH SPOILIATION CLAIMS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the findings by the court relating to the vessel schooner *Felicity*, William Story, master; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the findings by the court

relating to the vessel ship *Seymour*, Paul Gould, master; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. ALLEE presented petitions of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Wilmington; of the Riddle Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, of Wilmington; of the congregation of the First Methodist Protestant Church of Dover; of the Baptist Young People's Union of the North Baptist Church, of Wilmington; of the congregation of the Eighth Street Baptist Church, of Wilmington; of the Mount Salem Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, of Wilmington; of the Home Missionary Society of the Mount Salem Methodist Episcopal Church, of Wilmington; of the Ladies' Aid Society of the North Baptist Church, and of the Woman's Mission Circle of the North Baptist Church, of Wilmington; of the congregation of the North Baptist Church, of Wilmington, and of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Wilmington, all in the State of Delaware, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. QUAY presented petitions of the congregations of the Presbyterian Church of Claysville; the First Presbyterian Church of Finleyville; the United Presbyterian Church of Cannonsburg; the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Uniontown; the First Presbyterian Church of Uniontown; the Cumberland Presbyterian Church of Uniontown; the Baptist Church of Uniontown; the Christian Church of Uniontown; the Mount Rose Baptist Church, of Uniontown; the Lutheran Church of Uniontown; the Episcopal Church of Uniontown; the Second Presbyterian Church of Uniontown; the First Methodist Protestant Church of Uniontown; the Presbyterian Church of West Newton; the Methodist Episcopal Church of Philipsburg; the Liberty Presbyterian Church, of Pittsburg; the North Presbyterian Church, of Allegheny; the Christ United Evangelical Church, of Philadelphia; the Tabernacle Presbyterian Church, of Pittsburg, and of the Germantown Congregational Church, of Germantown, Philadelphia; of the Home Missionary Society of the Tabernacle Presbyterian Church, of Pittsburg; of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Cross Creek; of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the First United Presbyterian Church of New Castle; of the Home Missionary Society of the Presbyterian Church of Knox; of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the Presbyterian Church of West Newton; of the Missionary Society of the First Presbyterian Church of Pittsburg; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Blairsville, Uniontown, Harlansburg, and Washington, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. SPOONER presented a petition of the Woman's Club of Lake Mills, Wis., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. CLAPP presented a petition of the Foreign Missionary Society of the Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church, and a petition of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church, all of St. Paul, in the State of Minnesota, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. ALLISON presented a memorial of the Ministerial Association of Villisca, Iowa, remonstrating against holding sessions of Congress on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

He also presented a memorial of George Strong Post, No. 19, Department of Iowa, Grand Army of the Republic, of Fairfield, Iowa, remonstrating against the placing of a statue of Gen. Robert E. Lee in the Capitol; which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also presented a petition of Local Division No. 114, Order of Railway Telegraphers, of Perry, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the compensation of telegraph operators in the United States Signal Corps; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the National Association of Retail Druggists of Washington, D. C., praying for a reduction of the tax on alcohol to 70 cents per proof gallon; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Machinists' Local Union No. 254, American Federation of Labor, of Des Moines, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to reorganize the Bureau of Labor upon a nonpartisan basis; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Synod of Iowa, held at Shenandoah, Iowa, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the Friday Club of Newton; of the congregation of the United Presbyterian Church of Winterset; of the Tuesday Club of Cedar Falls; of the Study Club of Clarinda; of sundry citizens of Bedford, and of the Synod of Iowa, of Shenandoah, all in the State of Iowa, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. LONG presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Wichita, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent unjust discrimination in tariff rates; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Baxter Post, No. 123, Department of Kansas, Grand Army of the Republic, of Baxter Springs, Kans., and a petition of Woodson Post, No. 185, Department of Kansas, Grand Army of the Republic, of Yates Center, Kans., praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Harvey County; of the Southside Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Newton; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Moran; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Chetopa; of the congregation of the United Presbyterian Church of Chetopa, and of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hutchinson, all in the State of Kansas, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of Thomas J. Stewart Camp, No. 72, Sons of Veterans, of Shamokin, Pa., praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Bangor; of the Bethlehem Lutheran Sunday School, of Philadelphia; of the Daughters of Liberty, of Philadelphia; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Philadelphia; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Meadville; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Mahanoy City; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Bucks County; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Nanticoke; of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Nanticoke; of the congregation of the Christian Church of Connellsville; of the Ladies' Aid Society of Connellsville; of the United Brethren Sunday School of Connellsville; of the trustees of the Methodist Protestant Church of Connellsville; of the board of stewards of the Methodist Protestant Church of Connellsville; of the congregation of the United Brethren Church of Connellsville; of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the United Brethren Church of Connellsville; of the Missionary Society of Connellsville; of the Ladies' Aid and Missionary Society of Connellsville; of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Connellsville; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New London; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of New London; of the Epworth League of the Methodist Episcopal Church of New London; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of New London; of the Woman's Home Missionary Society and Woman's Foreign Missionary Society of Carbondale; of the New Century Club, of Carbondale; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Edenburg; of the Epworth League of Harrisburg; of the congregation of the Baptist Church of Hazleton; of the congregation of the Holiness Christian Church, of Mount Carmel; of the congregation of the Falls of Schuylkill Presbyterian Church, of Philadelphia; of the Trumbauer Young People's Society, of Mount Carmel; of the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society of Mount Carmel; of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Mount Carmel; of the Ministerial Association of Mount Carmel; of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Catawissa; of the Grangers, Patrons of Husbandry, of South Canaan; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Gravity; of the congregation of the Second Presbyterian Church of Germantown; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Honesdale; of the Ministerial Association of Columbia; of the congregation of Hermon Church, of Frankford; of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Carlisle; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Nebraska; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Nebraska, and of sundry citizens of Shillsburg and Hydettown, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

GREAT CANALS OF THE WORLD.

Mr. MORGAN. I present a letter from the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, Department of Commerce and Labor, on the subject of the cost and business of the great canals of the world, including the Suez Canal, in respect to which the information comes down to a later date, I believe, than any that has ever been presented to Congress. I move that it be printed and referred to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1765) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia A. Burton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1766) granting a pension to Henry Jordan;

A bill (S. 1767) granting an increase of pension to William H. Smith (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1768) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Gully (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1769) granting an increase of pension to Junius Abbott.

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced a bill (S. 1770) to correct the military record of Jacob W. Perkins; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1771) for the relief of William H. Anderson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 1772) granting an increase of pension to Louise K. Bard; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 1773) to correct the military record of William Moore;

A bill (S. 1774) for the relief of Frank Oldengot, alias Frank Oltencott;

A bill (S. 1775) to correct the military record of James E. Freeman;

A bill (S. 1776) to correct the military record of Patrick Morrissey;

A bill (S. 1777) for the relief of Joseph M. Reed; and

A bill (S. 1778) for the relief of Jonathan Bush.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 1779) for the relief of Caroline Murtagh, widow of the late William J. Murtagh, formerly proprietor of the National Republican, of Washington, D. C.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1780) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Appleton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1781) granting an increase of pension to James F. Nosler;

A bill (S. 1782) granting an increase of pension to John W. Coons;

A bill (S. 1783) granting a pension to William H. Ellingwood (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1784) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Johnson; and

A bill (S. 1785) granting an increase of pension to John Zimmerman (with accompanying papers).

Mr. PATTERSON introduced a bill (S. 1786) restoring James G. Field, naval surgeon, to the line of promotion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. CLAPP introduced a bill (S. 1787) for the relief of Jean Louis Legare, of the Dominion of Canada; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1788) granting a pension to Sarah L. Nichols; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LONG introduced a bill (S. 1789) permitting railroad companies owning railroads in the Indian Territory to sell and convey the whole or any part thereof, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1790) for the relief of Simon Regnier; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1791) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Newton,

in the State of Kansas; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1792) for the relief of James W. Morgan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1793) for the relief of John C. Brown; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1794) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Walkinshaw;

A bill (S. 1795) granting an increase of pension to Leander Smith;

A bill (S. 1796) granting an increase of pension to Matthew Woodworth;

A bill (S. 1797) granting a pension to Ellen H. Sharp;

A bill (S. 1798) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Cole;

A bill (S. 1799) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Decker;

A bill (S. 1800) granting an increase of pension to Charles Willauer;

A bill (S. 1801) granting a pension to Mary J. Haas;

A bill (S. 1802) granting an increase of pension to Isaac M. Couch;

A bill (S. 1803) granting an increase of pension to John M. Morgan;

A bill (S. 1804) granting a pension to Catherine Pixley;

A bill (S. 1805) granting an increase of pension to Edwin A. Welch;

A bill (S. 1806) granting an increase of pension to David Bennett;

A bill (S. 1807) granting an increase of pension to James Gray;

A bill (S. 1808) granting a pension to James L. Dyer;

A bill (S. 1809) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Freeman; and

A bill (S. 1810) granting an increase of pension to George W. Thomas.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 1811) for the relief of Sylvester H. Lee; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1812) granting a pension to Mary A. Artman;

A bill (S. 1813) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Keller;

A bill (S. 1814) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Kauffman (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1815) granting a pension to Catharine Elliot (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1816) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Shanabrough (with accompanying papers).

Mr. LODGE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1817) granting a pension to Michael J. Meehan (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1818) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Craigne;

A bill (S. 1819) granting a pension to Charles P. Skinner; and

A bill (S. 1820) granting a pension to Martha W. Pollard (with accompanying papers).

Mr. LODGE (for Mr. HOAR) introduced a bill (S. 1821) for the relief of Catherine Grace; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENT TO INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CLAPP submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$5,000 to enable the President to appoint a commission to investigate the claim of the Pillager tribe or band of Chippewa Indians of Minnesota for compensation for the land ceded by them to the United States by the treaty of August 21, 1847, intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning business is closed, and the question is on the adoption of the resolution offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], providing for the appointment of the standing and select committees of the Senate.

Mr. HALE. We may as well dispose of it now, Mr. President. I offer an amendment, to come in at the end of the list, providing for an additional committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

On Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.—Messrs. Pettus (chairman), Bate, Long.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. After the resolution is adopted I have a resolution to offer about the employment of clerks of new committees. Let the resolution be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. GORMAN. I ask the Senator from Maine to give way to me for a moment.

Mr. HALE. I will withhold the additional resolution.

Mr. GORMAN. I wish to make a request in connection with the resolution just adopted. In the list of committees which has been adopted by the Senate I notice, by a reference to the report on the table, that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE] is chairman of the minority Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE] is also the chairman of another minority committee. In view of the action of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent (and I do it at the request of the Senator from Tennessee) that he be excused from service upon the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine, and that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] be appointed in his place.

Mr. HALE. There is no objection to that, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed modification will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Strike out the name of Mr. BATE where it appears in the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine as chairman, and insert in lieu the name of Mr. MORGAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The resolution as agreed to is as follows:

Resolved, That the following, commencing December 1, 1903, shall constitute the standing and select committees of the Senate for the Fifty-eighth Congress:

STANDING COMMITTEES.

On Agriculture and Forestry.—Messrs. Proctor (chairman), Hansbrough, Warren, Foster of Washington, Dolliver, Quarles, Quay, Bate, Money, Simmons, Latimer.

On Appropriations.—Messrs. Allison (chairman), Hale, Cullom, Perkins, Warren, Wetmore, Quay, Gallinger, Cockrell, Teller, Berry, Tillman, Daniel.

To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.—Messrs. Kean (chairman), Warren, Millard, Money, Patterson.

On Canadian Relations.—Messrs. Fulton (chairman), Dryden, Hoar, Hale, Fairbanks, Tillman, Bailey, Clark of Montana, Clarke of Arkansas.

On the Census.—Messrs. Quarles (chairman), Hale, Platt of New York, McCumber, McComas, Burton, Kearns, McEnery, Taliaferro, Blackburn, Bailey.

On Civil Service and Retrenchment.—Messrs. Perkins (chairman), Lodge, Elkins, Platt of New York, Millard, Bate, Dubois, McLaurin, Clarke of Arkansas.

On Claims.—Messrs. Warren (chairman), Stewart, Kean, Clapp, Burnham, Burton, Allee, Fulton, Smoot, Martin, Taliaferro, McLaurin, Foster of Louisiana, Overman.

On Coast and Insular Survey.—Messrs. Ankeny (chairman), Foster of Washington, Hawley, Fairbanks, Allee, Morgan, Berry, Clay, Culberson.

On Coast Defenses.—Messrs. Mitchell (chairman), Hawley, Alger, Ball, Ankeny, Heyburn, Culberson, Taliaferro, Clay, Simmons, Foster of Louisiana.

On Commerce.—Messrs. Frye (chairman), Elkins, Nelson, Gallinger, Penrose, Hanna, Depew, Perkins, Foster of Washington, Quarles, Alger, Berry, Martin, Clay, Mallory, Foster of Louisiana, Stone.

On Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia.—Messrs. Martin (chairman), Latimer, Aldrich, Hopkins, Long.

On Cuban Relations.—Messrs. Platt of Connecticut (chairman), Aldrich, Spooner, Burnham, Mitchell, Kittredge, Hopkins, Teller, Money, Taliaferro, Simmons.

On the District of Columbia.—Messrs. Gallinger (chairman), Hansbrough, Stewart, Dillingham, Foster of Washington, Foraker, Scott, Gamble, Martin, Mallory, Simmons, Dubois, Gorman.

On Education and Labor.—Messrs. McComas (chairman), Penrose, Dolliver, Clapp, Burnham, Daniel, Gibson, Newlands, Stone.

On Engrossed Bills.—Messrs. Cockrell (chairman), Hoar, Clapp.

On Enrolled Bills.—Messrs. Dryden (chairman), Hopkins, Foster of Louisiana.

To Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service.—Messrs. Clapp (chairman), Hoar, Ball, Smoot, Culberson, Simmons, McCreary.

On Finance.—Messrs. Aldrich (chairman), Allison, Platt of Connecticut, Burrows, Platt of New York, Hansbrough, Spooner, Penrose, Daniel, Teller, Money, Bailey, Gorman.

On Fisheries.—Messrs. Hopkins (chairman), Proctor, Frye, Perkins, Fulton, Mallory, McEnery, Bailey, Overman.

On Foreign Relations.—Messrs. Cullom (chairman), Frye, Lodge, Clark of Wyoming, Foraker, Spooner, Fairbanks, Kean, Morgan, Bacon, Money, Clark of Montana, McCreary.

On Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.—Messrs. Burton (chairman), Depew, Perkins, Kearns, Kittredge, Burnham, Ankeny, Morgan, Tillman, Gibson, Overman.

On the Geological Survey.—Messrs. Foster of Washington (chairman), Elkins, Fairbanks, Heyburn, Money, Cockrell, Newlands.

On Immigration.—Messrs. Dillingham (chairman), Penrose, Fairbanks, Lodge, Dryden, McComas, McLaurin, Patterson, Latimer, Clarke of Arkansas, McCreary.

On Indian Affairs.—Messrs. Stewart (chairman), Platt of Connecticut, McCumber, Bard, Quay, Clapp, Gamble, Clark of Wyoming, Long, Morgan, Dubois, Clark of Montana, Teller, Stone, Overman.

On Indian Depredations.—Messrs. Allee (chairman), Beveridge, Dillingham, Dietrich, Smoot, Long, Bacon, Martin, Berry, Pettus, McLaurin.

On Interoceanic Canals.—Messrs. Hanna (chairman), Platt of New York, Mitchell, Millard, Kittredge, Dryden, Hopkins, Morgan, Carmack, Taliaferro, Gorman.

On Interstate Commerce.—Messrs. Elkins (chairman), Cullom, Aldrich, Kean, Dolliver, Foraker, Clapp, Millard, Tillman, McLaurin, Carmack, Foster of Louisiana, Newlands.

On Irrigation.—Messrs. Bard (chairman), Warren, Stewart, Kearns, Dietrich, Hansbrough, Ankeny, Fulton, Bailey, Patterson, Gibson, Gorman, Newlands.

On the Judiciary.—Messrs. Hoar (chairman), Platt of Connecticut, Clark of Wyoming, Fairbanks, Nelson, McComas, Depew, Mitchell, Bacon, Pettus, Culberson, Blackburn, Patterson.

On the Library.—Messrs. Wetmore (chairman), Hansbrough, Dryden, Clark of Montana, Gorman.

On Manufactures.—Messrs. Heyburn (chairman), McCumber, Gallinger, Allee, Clay, Gibson, Latimer.

On Military Affairs.—Messrs. Hawley (chairman), Proctor, Warren, Quarles, Scott, Foraker, Alger, Bate, Cockrell, Pettus, Blackburn.

On Mines and Mining.—Messrs. Scott (chairman), Stewart, Hanna, Kearns, Heyburn, Tillman, Clark of Montana, Clarke of Arkansas, Newlands.

On the Mississippi River and its Tributaries.—Messrs. Nelson (chairman), Dolliver, Millard, Hopkins, Bate, McEnery, McLaurin.

On Naval Affairs.—Messrs. Hale (chairman), Perkins, Platt of New York, Hanna, Penrose, Gallinger, Burrows, Tillman, Martin, McEnery, Blackburn.

On Organization, Conduct, and Expenditures of the Executive Departments.—Messrs. Quay (chairman), Wetmore, Beveridge, Allison, Allee, McLaurin, Blackburn, Carmack, Stone.

On Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.—Messrs. Foraker (chairman), Depew, Wetmore, Foster of Washington, Mitchell, Kearns, Burton, Cockrell, Mallory, Blackburn, Clark of Montana.

On Pacific Railroads.—Messrs. Dolliver (chairman), Frye, Stewart, Millard, Kittredge, Morgan, Taliaferro, McCreary, Latimer.

On Patents.—Messrs. Kittredge (chairman), McComas, Clapp, Smoot, Mallory, Foster of Louisiana, Latimer.

On Pensions.—Messrs. McCumber (chairman), Scott, Foster of Washington, Burton, Burnham, Alger, Ball, Smoot, Taliaferro, Patterson, Carmack, Gibson, Overman.

On the Philippines.—Messrs. Lodge (chairman), Hale, Proctor, Beveridge, Burrows, McComas, Dietrich, Long, Culberson, Dubois, Carmack, McCreary, Stone.

On Post-Offices and Post-Roads.—Messrs. Penrose (chairman), Dolliver, Lodge, Beveridge, Mitchell, Proctor, Burrows, Scott, Burton, Clay, Culberson, Taliaferro, Simmons, Gorman.

On Printing.—Messrs. Platt of New York (chairman), Elkins, Gorman.

On Private Land Claims.—Messrs. Teller (chairman), McEnery, Pettus, Hale, Kean, Gamble, Burton.

On Privileges and Elections.—Messrs. Burrows (chairman), Hoar, McComas, Foraker, Depew, Beveridge, Dillingham, Hopkins, Pettus, Dubois, Bailey, Overman, Clarke of Arkansas.

On Public Buildings and Grounds.—Messrs. Fairbanks (chairman), Warren, Scott, Quarles, McCumber, Wetmore, Quay, Culberson, Simmons, Clay, Stone, Latimer.

On Public Health and National Quarantine.—Messrs. Morgan (chairman), McEnery, Mallory, Culberson, Spooner, Depew, Ball, Heyburn, Long.

On Public Lands.—Messrs. Hansbrough (chairman), Nelson, Clark of Wyoming, Bard, Kearns, Gamble, Burton, Dietrich, Fulton, Berry, McEnery, McLaurin, Gibson, Dubois, Newlands.

On Railroads.—Messrs. Clark of Wyoming (chairman), Nelson, Hawley, Bard, Allee, Ankeny, Smoot, Bacon, Pettus, Money, Carmack.

On the Revision of the Laws of the United States.—Messrs. Depew (chairman), Proctor, Fulton, Heyburn, Long, Daniel, Mallory, Bailey, Patterson.

On Revolutionary Claims.—Messrs. Tillman (chairman), Bate, Platt of Connecticut, Alger, Ball.

On Rules.—Messrs. Spooner (chairman), Aldrich, Hoar, Elkins, Teller, Cockrell, Bacon.

On Territories.—Messrs. Beveridge (chairman), Dillingham, Nelson, Bard, Quay, Burnham, Kean, Bate, Patterson, Clarke of Arkansas, Newlands.

On Transportation Routes to the Seaboard.—Messrs. Gamble (chairman), Clark of Wyoming, Perkins, Ball, Allee, Pettus, Daniel, Dubois, Clarke of Arkansas.

On the University of the United States.—Messrs. Long (chairman), Frye, Wetmore, Burnham, Dillingham, Dryden, Allison, Clay, Carmack, Blackburn, Foster of Louisiana.

SELECT COMMITTEES.

To Investigate the Condition of the Potomac River Front at Washington.—Messrs. Millard (chairman), Frye, Beveridge, Allee, Martin, Bacon, Clark of Montana.

On Woman Suffrage.—Messrs. Bacon (chairman), Berry, Wetmore, Bard, Mitchell.

On Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress.—Messrs. Berry (chairman), Stone, Cullom, Allison, Mitchell.

On Transportation and Sale of Meat Products.—Messrs. Daniel (chairman), Stone, McCumber, Quarles, Ball.

On the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians.—Messrs. Bate (chairman), Teller, Dietrich, Kittredge, Burrows.

On Industrial Expositions.—Messrs. Burnham (chairman), Hawley, Hansbrough, Lodge, Clapp, Alger, Fulton, Daniel, Cockrell, Carmack, Gibson, McCreary, Newlands.

On National Banks.—Messrs. Kearns (chairman), Penrose, Ankeny, McEnery, Gibson.

To Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands.—Messrs. Dietrich (chairman), Heyburn, Morgan.

On Examination and Disposition of Documents.—Messrs. Alger (chairman), Kean, Hopkins.

On Ventilation and Acoustics.—Messrs. Ball (chairman), Gallinger, Gamble.

On Standards, Weights, and Measures.—Messrs. Smoot (chairman), Dolliver, Long, Clark of Montana, McCreary.

On Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.—Messrs. Pettus (chairman), Bate, Long.

Mr. HALE. I offer an additional resolution, which I ask may be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Examination and Disposition of Documents, and the Committee on Ventilation and Acoustics, and the Committee on Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments be, and they hereby are, each authorized to employ, on and after the 1st day of December, 1903, a clerk, who shall be paid at the rate of \$1,800 per annum from the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

Mr. HALE. The resolution provides for the three new committees which have been established.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It must be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. HALE. There is no objection to that course. The committee can report it to-day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be so referred.

Mr. GORMAN. I wish to suggest to the Senator from Maine that if the resolution is adopted in its present form it will begin the 1st day of December, leaving an interim of a few days for the clerk of one or two of the minority chairmanships, and it ought to take effect at once.

Mr. HALE. The general resolution provides that the whole matter shall take effect on the 1st of December. It applies to the whole list, including all the committees.

Mr. GORMAN. But the Senator from Maine will understand that under the rules of the Senate each Senator who is not chairman of a committee is entitled to a clerk at fourteen or fifteen hundred dollars, whatever it is, and that the moment he becomes chairman the pay of his personal clerk ceases.

Mr. HALE. That is all arranged in the office of the Secretary. A Senator holds his general place until he becomes chairman, and then he has a clerk under the provision just submitted. None of them takes effect before the 1st of December.

Mr. GORMAN. The committees do not take effect until then?

Mr. HALE. That was provided for in the resolution submitted day before yesterday. The resolution takes effect on the 1st of December.

Mr. SPOONER. Let the pending resolution be read again.

The Secretary again read the resolution.

Mr. HALE. That has been adapted to the other resolution which I offered, and which provides that the changes in committees shall take effect on December 1, so that they shall all proceed together.

Mr. GORMAN. I understand from the Senator from Maine that the committees will take effect on the 1st of December. I did not notice the phraseology. Committees are meeting now from day to day and will meet on very important matters between this time and the 1st of December. Do I understand that it is the Senator's intention that we shall remain without our full minority representation in the meantime?

Mr. HALE. I do not suppose that any practical question of that kind arises.

Mr. GORMAN. It is rather embarrassing. I myself have experienced it.

Mr. HALE. I fancy there will be no trouble of that kind. There are very few committees meeting.

Mr. GORMAN. But why not have the committees take effect from the date of the passage of the resolution?

Mr. HALE. There ought to be some general date fixed in the future, so that all the accounts can be adapted. This was done on consultation; and it was thought best to name a specific day. It was suggested that it take effect at the beginning of the regular session, but that will be seven days later. Finally the committee concluded that it would be better to make it the 1st day of December for every committee. I do not think that any practical difficulty is going to arise.

Mr. President, if this matter is disposed of, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the next order of business.

REPUBLIC OF CUBA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next order of business is the motion of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution (S. R. 15) inviting Cuba to become a State of the American Union, introduced by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], was referred to the Committee on Relations with Cuba.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I desire to have a vote on the motion. I should like to have the reference reconsidered, and then, after being reconsidered, as some Senators wish to debate the joint resolution, I will ask that it lie on the table.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I did not understand the motion of the Senator from Maine.

Mr. HALE. It is the motion which I made to reconsider the vote by which the Senator's resolution was referred to the Committee on Relations with Cuba.

I said, and will repeat, that I desire to have the vote taken now on reconsideration; but I shall not call it up for any further movement at present, because Senators desire to debate it hereafter. The matter will lie on the table, and then it will be open for the future action of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Maine, to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Relations with Cuba.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Now, I ask that the joint resolution be laid on the table to be called up by me at some future time, as Senators may desire to discuss it further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine asks that the joint resolution be now laid on the table. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. HALE. Subject to being called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Subject to his call. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Maine for a moment to the matter of the former resolution.

It occurs to me that without any possibility of confusing accounts, in view of the last resolution which the Senator had adopted, it would really be better if, by unanimous consent, the resolution were changed so as to take effect at once. This is a session of the Senate. The committees when the session convened were not full. There were vacancies on the Republican side of committees and vacancies on the Democratic, or minority, side of committees. Under the resolution as it stands the committees are not equipped; the vacancies are not filled until the 1st of December. Why should not each member of a committee become absolutely a member of the committee from the time of the adoption of the resolution?

Mr. HALE. I tried to explain that the committee had considered that question, and it is more convenient in making up the accounts to have a full month. The matter is unimportant. It involves only a few days. December will be here before the Senator knows it. There is no actual business that is going to be interfered with or prostrated because the committees are not filled up now. Therefore the committee concluded it would be far better to have the resolution take effect on the 1st day of December. Then the Secretary will open all the accounts with the beginning of the month; there will be no part of a month going over; and in the meantime things will be going on just as they are and just as they have gone on for three weeks.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator is mistaken in his supposition that I will not know when the 1st of December arrives. I expect to know that.

I do not know that it is very material; but I think there is some point in the suggestion of the Senator from Maryland. I do not see how it should confuse accounts. The accounts of the Senate do not depend upon the membership of the committees. The members of the Senate are not paid for service on committees except as they receive a salary.

I conceive that there would be confusion perhaps as to the clerks of the new committees if the resolution which has just been offered by the Senator had not been adopted. He is clearly right that each Senator, undisturbed by any action of the Senate, shall keep his clerk until the 1st day of December; and if he shall then become a chairman, he will have a right to appoint a clerk of the committee, who acts as his clerk. But it does not seem quite dignified—that is the truth of it—to adopt a resolution appointing committees, making the membership when adopted full, and yet provide that it shall not take effect until hereafter. However, it is not very material, as the Senator said.

TRADE RELATIONS WITH CUBA.

Mr. CULLOM. If there is nothing further before the Senate, I should like to call up the bill carrying into effect the convention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois calls up House bill 1921.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1921) to carry into effect a convention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, signed on the 11th day of December, in the year 1902.

Mr. CULLOM. My object in calling up the bill is to have it read and to give an opportunity, so that if any Senator desires to do so he can talk upon it to-day or on any day during the present session, my purpose being to give every opportunity possible that is desired to discuss the bill. If no Senator desires to discuss it to-day, I would like, then, to make it the unfinished business of the session from day to day until the session shall close, so that at the beginning of the next regular session the bill may be taken up according to the order which was made and discussed until it is disposed of on the date fixed. I ask that the bill be read.

Mr. TELLER. I wish to ask the Senator a question. I suppose it is his intention simply to call it up formally, and if no one wants to speak, to let it lie over?

Mr. CULLOM. I will let it lie over, making it the unfinished business, and lay it over from time to time.

Mr. TELLER. There is no objection to that course that I know of.

Mr. CULLOM. That is all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, an order will be made, making it the unfinished business of the Senate. The bill will be read by the Secretary.

The Secretary read the bill.

Mr. CULLOM. I have had the bill called up and read for the purpose of giving any Senator an opportunity to speak upon it to-day if he sees proper. If not, I shall hope to keep it before the Senate as the unfinished business during the remainder of this session, so as to give any Senator an opportunity to talk upon it whenever the Senate is in session. If any Senator now desires to take the floor on the bill, I am anxious to have him do so. If no Senator desires to speak, I will ask—

Mr. GORMAN. I understand that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. CARMACK] desires to address the Senate on the bill.

Mr. CARMACK. If it will not interfere with the convenience of any other Senator, I will say what I have to say about the bill this morning.

Mr. CULLOM. Certainly.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President, the ratification of the Cuban treaty has been urged upon us in the President's message with reasons which appeal to diverse springs of action in the human heart. The President tells us, in substance, that we must ratify this treaty to save our honor and to help our trade; that we must act in this matter from a stern and self-sacrificing sense of duty and with a lively regard for the profits that will accrue. It is an opportunity, such as seldom comes, to worship God and get your money back; to be diligent in business while serving the Lord. The Cuban treaty is presented to us by the President in the attractive double aspect of a bargain counter and a missionary box. You put a nickel in the slot for sweet charity's sake and get more than your money's worth of chewing gum and cigars.

Happy is that Republican Administration, Mr. President, which is driven by a selfish motive to a righteous deed, and is thus enabled to perform a Christian duty without exercising any of the Christian virtues. It is quite another story when the obligations of honor, and respect for law, and regard for the Constitution happen to come in conflict with selfish and unlawful desires.

Still, Mr. President, I think it is the duty of Congress to hear with patience any appeal that may be made to its conscience, from whatever source it may come. I realize that our relations with Cuba are peculiar, and I feel the force of what the President has to say along this line. For these reasons I have been willing to vote for almost any reasonable treaty which might be presented. I felt that, having imposed our guardianship upon the people of Cuba and then left them, as we were told, on the edge of famine and despair, we had incurred an obligation to care for their interests, even though it should involve some sacrifice of our own.

But the appeals made in the name of mercy and humanity are now known to have no basis in truth. The revenues of Cuba are abundant. Her treasury is full. Her people are prosperous and contented. We are under no moral obligation to rush to the aid of a people who do not need our assistance; and if we are under any such obligation, we are certainly not bound in honor to ratify any treaty or pass any bill that may be presented for our consideration, no matter what it may contain.

Give me a treaty that is fair and even generous to Cuba and only just and honest to the people of the United States, and I will vote for it. But no man can pledge my faith to a treaty which is itself a violation of pledged faith and honorable obligation, and which, under the pretense of opening for us the markets of Cuba, slams the door in the face of 50,000,000 people in Central and South America.

You had a treaty here entirely satisfactory to the people of Cuba, a treaty already ratified and approved by the Government of that country. You take that treaty and you write into it a miserable bargain with the protected interests of the United States—a bargain, I say, which was in gross violation of good faith to our own people, a bargain which closed the door to reciprocity with other countries—and you insist that we shall make that bargain in the name of honor and in the name of reciprocity.

I shall vote against this treaty, Mr. President, for reasons very different, perhaps, from those which may influence the opposition of some other Senators. If this measure would reduce the price of sugar to the American consumer, I should regard it as one powerful argument in its favor. But we know that it will not do so. The importations of Cuban sugar will fall far short of supplying the deficiencies of American production. There must still be a large amount of sugar imported subject to the regular rates of duty. There will not be one price in the American market for free sugar and another price for taxed sugar, but one price for all, whether home-grown, imported free, or dutiable. That price will be the world price plus the duty and the cost of carriage.

So I say, Mr. President, this measure will not reduce by the fraction of a cent either the profits of the American sugar producer or the expenses of the American consumer, and there is no reason why the one should feel any great alarm or the other any great enthusiasm for the passage of this bill.

One of the reasons why I oppose this bill is that it not only

does not now reduce the tax on sugar, but that it provides that there shall be no such reduction in the future. We are appealed to in the name of honor and good faith. In honor and good faith you can not pass this bill, because it distinctly and in plain terms violates the solemn promises that were made when the tariff of 1897 was enacted.

You have written into that treaty and into this bill a provision that during the life of the Cuban treaty no treaty shall be made with any other foreign country that reduces the duties on sugar below the rates fixed in the existing law. I say, Mr. President, that that is in flagrant violation of the promises made when Congress enacted what the very authors of it have described as the "exorbitant duty upon sugar."

I repeat it, sir, the very authors of the sugar duty in the act of 1897 admitted that it was excessive; that it was exorbitant; that it was far higher than was needed for any just purpose of protection. It was said by my friend the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER]; it was said by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS]; it was admitted by the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee when that bill was under consideration, that the sugar duty was far higher than was needed for any purpose of protection; that it was an unjust and oppressive tax upon the American people, and the promise was that by reciprocity arrangement that tax should be reduced.

How do you propose to redeem that pledge? The advocates of this bill, Mr. President, have insisted earnestly and with truth that it will not reduce the tax on sugar by the fraction of a cent. Yet they have inserted into the body of the treaty and of this bill a provision that will prevent any reduction in the future.

I ask, Mr. President, if it is honor and good faith to impose an exorbitant duty in the name of reciprocity and for the sake of foreign trade, and then devote every dollar of that duty to unjust and unnecessary protection?

This measure, Mr. President, simply diverts some millions of dollars from the public Treasury into the hands of individuals. I shall not argue whether it will go into the coffers of the sugar trust or into the pockets of the Cuban sugar planters; but this we all know, that it will not reduce the taxes of the people by one cent; it will reduce the revenues of the Government by millions of dollars, and this money paid out of the pockets of the American people will go into private pockets.

We had a promise by the Republicans who enacted this tariff that they would reduce it by not less than 20 per cent through reciprocity arrangements. That would save about \$10,000,000 in taxes to the American people, and that is what we are paying, Mr. President, in cold cash out of the pockets of the American people for whatever privileges we obtain in the Cuban market. You pay not only that, but you formally and by bargain surrender every opportunity to have reciprocity with all the sugar-producing countries of the world.

This is not presented, Mr. President, simply as one act in a general policy of reciprocal trade. It is presented as the end-all and the be-all of that great policy which, in the magniloquent language of the Republican platform, was to give us control of the trade of the world. It is not conceived in a spirit of friendliness, but in a spirit of deadly hostility to a liberal trade policy. It is the last gasp, the dying groan, the very death rattle of Republican reciprocity. You have bargained in this bill that reciprocity shall die now and here.

I can understand, Mr. President, how the enemies of reciprocity can support this bill, as most of them are doing, but for the life of me I can not comprehend how it can receive the support of any man who pretends to be a friend of reciprocity. You have brought reciprocity, sir, to this condition: You violate the solemn promise made to reduce taxation of the people, and you do it in the name of honor; you close up every opportunity to have reciprocity with the nations of the earth, and you do that in the name of reciprocity.

What reciprocity treaties could you make—what could you ever have made under this bill? Why, Mr. President, sugar has been the basis of all the reciprocity we had under the McKinley Act, and, if not the basis, it is certainly a very important part of all the reciprocity we ever hoped to have under the Dingley Act.

I hold in my hand, sir, a report made by the Ways and Means Committee of the first session of the Fifty-fourth Congress, in 1896. It was a report made for the purpose of glorifying reciprocity. It traces the efforts, beginning away back in 1882, to extend our export trade with the Latin-American countries through reciprocity treaties, which ended in the international conference in 1889, in which seventeen of those Republics were represented. Mr. Blaine presented that report to the President with a letter of recommendation. He recommended an amendment to the pending McKinley tariff bill which would enable this country, in his opinion, to get free markets in all the Latin-American countries for practically all the agricultural and many of the manufactured

products of the United States. By what means was that to be obtained? In concluding his statement, Mr. Blaine said:

Of course the exchanges involved in these propositions would be rendered impossible if Congress, in its wisdom, should repeal the duty on sugar by direct legislation, instead of allowing the same object to be attained by the reciprocal arrangements suggested.

In other words, Mr. President, Mr. Blaine recognized, as did the authors of this report, that freedom to manipulate the sugar duty was an absolute essential to any scheme of reciprocity with the Latin-American countries. To impress the importance of the sugar duty he declared that the sugar-growing countries comprised four-fifths, or 40,000,000 people, of Latin America, and that a very slight discrimination in their favor on the sugar duty would vastly extend our commerce with those countries.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, all the reciprocity arrangements made with the South American countries were based upon sugar. Not only that, but the only two treaties we had with European countries have the same history. We negotiated and ratified treaties or reciprocal arrangements with Germany and with Austria-Hungary.

This report speaks in glowing terms of the vast benefits that accrued to American commerce by reason of the ratification of those treaties, which gave a discrimination of 30 per cent in favor of American wheat, flour, and other agricultural and manufactured products. Those treaties were based, I say, upon sugar; without sugar not one of them could ever have been made. It was the same way with the treaties negotiated but never ratified under the Dingley tariff act.

Mr. President, I have not conceded, and I do not concede, all the extravagant claims made by Republicans as to what was accomplished under the Blaine reciprocity arrangements. I have no extravagant faith in the virtue and practical operation of reciprocity. I do not believe we should say to other nations, "We will untax our people if you will untax yours; if you do not lighten the burdens upon your people we will punish you by heaping higher and heavier the burdens upon our own; we will injure your trade by plundering our people." I believe with Sir Robert Peel that the best way to fight a hostile tariff is by re-forming our own.

I do not believe, Mr. President, that we should put heavy and oppressive burdens of taxation upon our own country, to remain there until we can make arrangements with the nations of the earth to take them off. I do not believe that our fiscal system should be complicated with the fiscal systems of other nations. We make a tariff treaty, let us suppose, with Germany with regard to the tariff duties to be imposed upon a number of articles, and we afterwards find it to be a foolish and improvident treaty. We are then in a condition where we must either subject ourselves to the charge of violating a solemn treaty with a foreign power or we must get the consent of the German Empire before we can readjust and redistribute the burdens of taxation upon our own people.

So I say, Mr. President, I am not very much in love with reciprocity. I do not believe that it is the best way either to reduce taxes or to extend our trade. At the same time I will admit that it is better than no way at all, and it is the only way that ever has been promised by the Republican party. We have no right to demand that you carry out the Democratic platform, but we have a right to demand that you carry out your own.

I do not say that I am always and under all circumstances opposed to reciprocity. But I do mean to say that actual reciprocity can not be obtained without making actual concessions. A country must be willing to give as well as eager to take, and the condition to which reciprocity has come in this measure shows that no such policy ever can be executed by a party which makes a fetish of protection. The failure of reciprocity as a means of tariff reform is never so apparent as when a high protective party, holding office by the grace of the beneficiaries of protection, attempts to withdraw from the latter any portion of their spoils.

We enacted a tariff act in 1897 and we imposed duties high enough in all conscience to satisfy the greediest shark that ever called himself protector of American labor. Then we put on an extra margin to be bargained away by treaties with foreign countries to extend our foreign trade. We have been waiting all these years for our Government to drive a series of bargains with other nations to reduce the burdens it had laid upon its own people, and not one solitary treaty has been ratified to this good hour. The oppressive taxes that we imposed in the name of foreign trade have been appropriated entirely and exclusively to the purposes of domestic monopoly.

Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], in a notable speech delivered at the last session of Congress, spoke in a vein of deep dejection of the contemptuous manner in which the reciprocity treaties had been dealt with in this body, and said that more violence had been done to the protective system by the failure of his party to act upon these treaties than by all the

clamor and all the noise and all the invective of all the blatant free traders in the United States. I agree with the Senator from Iowa. No accusation we could make against the Republican party, however fortified by evidence, could be as effective as its own confession of hypocrisy, of violated promises, of taxes imposed under false pretenses.

The Senator said in that speech that not one line of Mr. Blaine's wisdom was left upon the statute books; that no step had been taken to realize President McKinley's magnificent dream. The policy advocated by President McKinley with such earnestness and power in his last public utterance has proved to be indeed the baseless fabric of a vision; it has dissolved and left not a rack behind. Who is responsible? If the Democratic party effaced every line of the wisdom of Mr. Blaine from the statute book, the Republican party, after being seven years in power, has not put a single line of it back.

I want to say, Mr. President, that in reality there never was much of Mr. Blaine's wisdom on this question in the statute book. The policy actually adopted fell very far short of the broad and comprehensive policy of Mr. Blaine.

In the report to which I have before referred, under the heading of "Mr. Blaine's recommendations," he is thus quoted:

"To escape the delay and uncertainty of treaties," Mr. Blaine suggested "an amendment to the pending tariff bill authorizing the President to declare the ports of the United States free to all the products of any nation of the American hemisphere," etc.

That was Mr. Blaine's policy, Mr. President. The plan actually adopted, as compared with that of Mr. Blaine, seems as impotent as a eunuch and as bloodless as a mummy. Mr. Blaine's policy comprehended free trade with all the nations of the American hemisphere to the north and the south—Canada, Mexico, Central and South America—free sugar, free hides, free wool, free coal, free lumber, absolute freedom to all the products of all the countries of the American hemisphere. That was the policy of Mr. Blaine. I say that policy was mutilated and emasculated by the protection sentiment in Congress. Still, Mr. President, it was the one redeeming feature of the McKinley bill. It was the only thing in that measure, according to Mr. Blaine's own statement, that would open a market for a single bushel of American wheat or a single barrel of American pork.

The Wilson Act did not in terms repeal the treaties adopted under Mr. Blaine. It contained an express provision that they should not be affected except so far as they were inconsistent with the provisions of that act. They were annulled simply by the tariff on sugar—by that and that only. When that act was passed, which, as the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] would say, expunged every line of the wisdom of Mr. Blaine from the statute books, there went up from the Republican party one universal chorus of damnation. I beg leave to ask, Mr. President, if the Democratic party deserves damnation for expunging the wisdom of Mr. Blaine from the statute book, how many years in purgatory does the Republican party deserve for refusing to put a single line of it back?

This report made by the Ways and Means Committee in 1896—Mr. Dingley being chairman of the committee and the present Senator from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] being then chairman of the subcommittee which made the report—this report, I say, was intended to glorify the results of reciprocity under Mr. Blaine and to damn the Democratic party for its terrible and destructive work in repealing the Republican policy of reciprocity. When the Dingley tariff was under discussion they again thundered their denunciation against the Democratic party, and declared that under that bill they would not only restore Mr. Blaine's plan of reciprocity, but that it should be enlarged and improved.

The present Senator from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS], then a member of the Ways and Means Committee and one of the authors of that bill, declared that reciprocity was to be the "crowning glory" of the Dingley tariff; that Mr. Blaine's policy was to be enlarged and improved and adapted to our commercial relations with Germany and Austria and France and Belgium and all the countries of Central and South America.

Mr. President, I beg leave to ask what has become of that policy thus improved, enlarged, and adapted to our commercial relations with Europe and South America, that was to give us reciprocity treaties with Germany and Austria and Belgium and France and all the countries to the south of us? What has become of it? Not a line of it on the statute book to this good hour, though the Republican party has had possession of the Government for seven years.

Mr. President, reciprocity was not simply an incident of the Dingley tariff. Reciprocity treaties were not simply to be the by-products of that great act. According to the Senator from Illinois, reciprocity was to be the main purpose, the crowning glory; all the other benefits to be derived from the Dingley tariff were to pale their ineffectual fires before the shining glory of reciprocity. Yet there has been no reciprocity. The rates of the Dingley

tariff were purposely made excessive to enable you to negotiate these treaties. The Senator from Illinois, when the bill was under discussion, expressly said so with reference to sugar, and the Senator from Iowa said so on the floor of the Senate.

The bill expressly provided for a general reduction of not more than 20 per cent. Mr. Kasson, of Iowa, the commissioner selected by Mr. McKinley to negotiate these treaties, expressly declared that the general rates of the Dingley tariff had been made excessive, had been made higher than was needed for the purposes of protection, in order to carry out the policy of reciprocity which the Republican party had promised in every platform and for the destruction of which it had denounced the Democratic party in every platform. The treaties were negotiated; they have been left to die, and no effort has been made to ratify them in this Senate.

The Senator from Illinois said that special provision had been made in that bill with reference to a reduction of the tariff on sugar, and among the other benefits to be derived from that he said it would afford a sufficient inducement to the German Government to reopen her markets to all the agricultural and manufactured products of the United States. Yet, sir, you now write a bargain into this measure that there shall be no such reduction, and that you shall not use the sugar duty for the purpose for which it was intended—to reopen the markets of Germany and other European and American countries by reciprocity. Why? How came that provision in the bill or in the treaty?

It was not put there on the insistence of Cuba. Cuba had never asked for it. She had ratified the treaty without such a provision being contained in it. It was put there, Mr. President, as a bargain with the sugar growers and as a general bargain with the protected interests of the United States that reciprocity should die with this treaty. I ask Republican Senators if they are willing that the great Dingley tariff shall be shorn of what the Senator from Illinois called its "crowning glory?" Are they willing to write "Ichabod" across the brow of that great measure and proclaim that its glory has departed? There is nothing left to represent that chief glory of the Dingley tariff except the Kasson treaties pending in this body.

What will be the effect of this treaty with Cuba and the measure now before the Senate on those treaties? Pass this bill, Mr. President, and you absolutely and utterly destroy the very treaties concerning which my friend from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] lifted up to heaven his wailing cry. He was here demanding that the Senate should act on the Kasson treaties. Yet my friend, I suppose, will vote for this bill, and when he does so he votes to kill every one of the reciprocity treaties—

Mr. DOLLIVER. May I interrupt the Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. CARMACK. I do.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The sugar schedule is not involved in the reciprocity treaty with France.

Mr. CARMACK. I was going to say with one exception, and with one exception only. Well, Mr. President, you are not going to ratify one of those treaties and kick all the other nations with whom reciprocity treaties have been negotiated. You know those treaties must stand or fall together, and, with the single exception of the treaty with France, sugar is involved in every one of them.

Mr. President, that is the plain question. The question is whether you are willing for the sake of this one treaty, and no more, to not only bind yourself not to reduce the taxes of the American people, but to bind yourself not to make any other reciprocity treaties with the sugar-growing nations of the world.

The Senator from Iowa was right, Mr. President, when he said that the failure of the Senate to act upon these reciprocity treaties would be a serious blow to protectionism. It will be, Mr. President, because it will demonstrate to the country the utter selfishness of the great protected interests of the United States and the utter subservience to those interests of the Republican party. When reciprocity dies at the hands of the Republican party the country will know that the very thing it is determined to have—some reduction of our oppressive tariff duties—can not be obtained by any concession, by any yielding, by any compromise on the part of the great trusts and monopolies of the country, and until they yield it can not be had from the Republican party.

Why should we be surprised if the Republican party enacts enormous and excessive duties under the name of reciprocity, and then devotes every dollar of such duties to protection? Republican history is but repeating itself in this particular. The Morrill tariff was enacted with the profuse apologies of its authors for its extortionate and excessive rates. The excuse was that there was a heavy internal tax levied upon manufactures, and that it was necessary to put an extra tariff rate upon these manufactured products to counterbalance the effect of the internal tax. That tariff was enacted, Mr. President, with the distinct promise that as soon

as those internal taxes should be removed the tariff would be reduced. Every vestige of those internal taxes was removed, and then the tariff was made higher than ever. The extraordinary expenses incident to the war were supposed to justify extraordinary rates of duty, but when those duties brought a redundant revenue the Republican party brought in a bill to decrease the revenues by increasing the taxes!

Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa need not hope that his idea or that other "Iowa idea," represented by Governor Cummins, ever will find any favor with the Republican party. He need not hope that the Republican party will ever permit high and extortionate rates of duty to be used for any other purpose than that of building up the wealth and power of monopoly. Governor Cummins, of the Senator's own State, sounded a bugle blast upon this question; he aroused an enthusiasm among the people, regardless of party, against a tariff that builds up trusts and monopolies. The staid old protectionist politicians of that State were startled and alarmed. The Speaker of the House of Representatives almost fell out of Congress to get out of the way of the onrush of the hosts of tariff reform.

But in doing that he did a signal service to the cause of protection. He called the attention of the great protected interests throughout the country to the fact that there was danger in the State of Iowa. They rallied. They proceeded to rectify the situation. They rectified the Republican politicians who, from their point of view, had gone wrong. They rectified Governor Cummins, and when the next Republican platform was made its tariff plank was just such as any monopolist in this country would have written.

I say the Senator from Iowa need not hope that he can carry his party with him on this proposition. The most that he can possibly hope for, if he can hope for that, is that he will be permitted to retain and advocate his own individual views. Governor Cummins was not permitted to do it.

Mr. BABCOCK of Wisconsin, chairman of the National Congressional Committee, raised a war cry; he thundered against the trusts; he demanded a reduction of excessive duties that were enabling monopolies to plunder the American people while selling abroad in competition with the pauper labor of all the world. But when the next campaign was on Mr. BABCOCK was forced or induced to repudiate his own utterances in language that was almost a personal insult to himself. Such has been the fate of every Republican leader who has shown spirit enough to revolt against the rule of monopoly. Such, I am sorry to say, will be the fate of my friend the Senator from Iowa.

I shall try to remember my friend as he stood here on that memorable occasion, the very Ajax Telamon of debate, hurling his denunciations at the perfidy of his own party. "His neck was clothed with thunder, and the glory of his nostrils was terrible." I shall try to remember him as he stood here upon that scene. Yet, Mr. President, I know that as it has been with Cummins, as it has been with BABCOCK, even so it will be with my friend from Iowa.

The Republican party has bidden farewell to reciprocity. It has bidden farewell to tariff revision in any form. A few months ago Doctor Schurman, of Cornell University, good, easy man, wishing to try once more the effect of alliterative melody in a Republican campaign, raised the war cry of "Roosevelt, Reciprocity, and Revision." What has become of the last two members of this blessed trinity? There seems to have been a radical revision of the Republican creed, which has left the unitarians in full control of the church. The trinity has been expunged from the Republican articles of faith. The trinitarian propaganda has been overwhelmed by the Mohammedan war cry of "Allah il Allah." Roosevelt is great, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I suppose, is his prophet!

The Republican party needs only the first word mentioned by Doctor Schurman. Whatever that word of ever-varying and multifarious but always strenuous meanings may have signified at bedtime last night, that was the creed of the Republican party at the breakfast table this morning. Whatever that word may mean to-night will be the policy of the Republican party to-morrow morning. But, Mr. President, if we can know anything of the purpose of that myriad-minded man, we know that he does not intend "reciprocity" and he does not intend "revision."

Mr. President, I believe the conditions not only in this country but throughout the world imperatively demand a sensible and conservative movement for the reformation and reduction of our tariff. Some of our Republican friends, with a strange fatuity, have rejoiced because of the reactionary movement for protection in Great Britain. That movement, Mr. President, so far as Mr. Chamberlain is concerned, is a political and not an economic movement. His avowed purpose is to bind together the dispersed and dissevered fragments of the British Empire and prevent its impending dissolution. But every man who has watched the temper of the British public must have perceived that that move-

ment derives a great part of its strength from British resentment of our exclusive tariff policy.

Mr. RITCHIE, the celebrated English statesman, was making a speech a few weeks ago in opposition to Mr. Chamberlain's policy. In the course of that speech he happened to suggest that Great Britain ought to preserve friendly relations with the United States. Though he spoke to a friendly audience, apparently, his speech was immediately overwhelmed with howls and hisses and cries of "McKinleyism!" and "Down with the Dingley tariff!"

Mr. President, that feeling, I say, furnishes the greatest strength to the movement in Great Britain for a tariff that will discriminate against the products of the United States and will favor the products of the British Empire throughout the world. The movement was not born of economic thought or economic wisdom. It was born of passion and resentment, and we know that nations are as much governed by their passions and their resentments and their antipathies as by any sound regard for their own welfare. Who can say to what extent British pugnacity will not go when fairly aroused and directed by such a born storm rider as Joe Chamberlain? Mr. Chamberlain has played the United States against the Continent with success, and, having accomplished his purpose and brought about an era of good feeling, is free to execute a hostile tariff against the United States.

We know that if a scheme of a discriminating tariff against the products of the United States is carried out it will be a staggering blow to the agricultural interests of this country. It is well enough to stand on a stump and wave the American flag and defy the darkening universe, but we know that if Great Britain, which furnishes the greatest market for our agricultural products, should impose a discriminating tariff against the wheat, the cotton, and the other products of the United States, it would be a serious injury to the agricultural interests of this country.

Mr. President, I believe that the very beginning of a more liberal policy on the part of the United States would be the end of Mr. Chamberlain's scheme. I earnestly believe that a victory for the Democratic party in the next campaign would be a victory for the Liberal party in Great Britain, and would end forever this scheme to impose taxes upon the agricultural products of this country.

Mr. President, I do not contemplate any general and indiscriminate assault upon our tariff schedules. I would be willing, for the present, to take the platform adopted and then repudiated by the Republican party of Iowa. I am willing that the stone which the builders of the Republican platform in Iowa rejected shall become the head of the corner, because it is a Democratic stone anyhow, and it never had any business in a Republican platform, and they did right to take it out.

I am willing to take as the basis of a Democratic movement in this direction the proposals made by Mr. BABCOCK, of Wisconsin. In order that there may be no charge, however false, or that there may be no ground for a charge that we contemplate a violent and destructive attack upon the industries of the United States, I am willing for the present to be guided by the best thought in the Republican party, which the Republican party is not free to follow because that thought is in line with the best thought and policy of the Democratic party.

I believe, Mr. President, in a tariff for revenue, a tariff which will impose the slightest possible restriction upon the interchange of commodities. I can not understand a definition of "freedom" that does not include freedom to buy and freedom to sell. I do not believe it is a proper function of the Government to direct the industrial occupations of the people, and I can not understand any definition of "socialism" that does not include the tariff policy of the Republican party.

And yet, Mr. President, we must deal with conditions as they exist. I know that individual rights may grow out of national wrongs, and I know that long-established systems, however evil and pernicious, can not without a general catastrophe be destroyed in a single day. For that reason I am willing to proceed gradually in this matter. I know that free trade was not reached in England by sudden flight. I know it was reached only by steady and progressive steps, each step vindicating itself and giving courage and confidence for the next.

There are upon our statute books duties so enormous, so exorbitant, so unnecessary that they can not be defended. There are duties there that have promoted the growth of great trusts and monopolies. There are articles of American manufacture which, by reason of the cheapness of their production, are sold in the most distant markets in free competition with the pauper labor of all the world. Yet, by reason of high protection, they are sold at extortionate prices in our own markets.

These are the considerations which, in my humble opinion, should for the present limit and direct the action of the Democratic party. It will be but a step in the right direction, but that step will be followed by another and another and another in the same direction, and in the end, Mr. President, without violence,

without panic, without disturbance, but with the free consent of an overwhelming majority of our people, we will have reached the goal of Democratic desires—a tariff for revenue, a condition in which taxation shall be levied for public purposes and not for private ends, and which will not enable one man to eat his bread in the sweat of another man's brow.

Mr. CULLOM. If no other Senator desires to speak to-day, I ask that the pending bill be made the unfinished business, so that it may be taken up whenever we meet again and any Senator desires to speak upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that order will be made.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to.

CLERKS TO COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE.

Mr. KEAN (Mr. PERKINS in the chair), from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution this day submitted by Mr. HALE, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Examination and Disposition of Documents, and the Committee on Ventilation and Acoustics, and the Committee on Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments be, and they hereby are, each authorized to employ, on and after the 1st day of December, 1903, a clerk, who shall be paid at the rate of \$1,800 per annum from the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

REPUBLIC OF CUBA.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. NEWLANDS. With the consent of the Senator from Illinois, I wish to say a few words.

Mr. CULLOM. I withdraw the motion if the Senator from Nevada desires to speak.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, in the debate the other day relating to the joint resolution (S. R. 15) inviting Cuba to become a State of the American Union, which I had the honor to present, it was stated by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] and also, I believe, by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] that the joint resolution proposed that the island of Porto Rico should become a part of the State of Cuba without consulting the island of Porto Rico; in other words, without her consent.

I wish to state that the suggestions which the joint resolution presents look to having an expression of the sentiment both of Cuba and Porto Rico upon this subject. If Cuba is disposed at all to consider the matter, the whole question can, by a popular vote, be presented to the Cuban people as to whether or not it is desirable to become a State in the American Union, and as to what changes are necessary in the constitution of the Republic in order to fit that Republic for statehood in the American Union.

In the same way the sense of Porto Rico can be taken as to whether or not that island desires to become a part of the State of Cuba, or a county of the State of Cuba, and, as such, a part of the American Union, enjoying constitutional rights and privileges, freedom of trade, and the power and privilege of joining in the selection of the President of the United States and of Senators and Representatives of the United States. The sense of that people can be taken by a popular vote as to whether or not they wish to remain a mere dependency of the United States, annexed to but not a part of the United States, subject to the absolute power and will of the United States, or whether by means of incorporation with Cuba they desire to become a part of a sovereign State of the Union.

In this way the doctrine of the consent of the governed will be vindicated by an expression of the will of the majority both in Cuba and in Porto Rico. Porto Rico is too small in territory to become a State. If Porto Rico wishes to remain a dependency, she can express her will. If she wishes to become a part of a sovereign State of the American Union, she can express her will by a popular vote. So I contend that this provision does not involve the incorporation of Porto Rico as a part of the State of Cuba without the consent of that island.

Another statement was made by the Senators who spoke upon that day—the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]—and that was that Cuba was not a dependent Republic. I assume that politically no one can deny that she certainly has abdicated a part of her sovereignty by the adoption of the Platt amendment and that she has become in a sense dependent upon this country.

But when I referred in my remarks to her dependence I referred principally not to a political dependence, but to an economic dependence. That seems to have been denied by the

Senators; and yet if you will look over the speeches of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House advocating reciprocity, if you will look over their reports, if you will look over the testimony of delegations representing Cuba, which appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House two years ago, you will find everywhere the fact prominently stated and urged that Cuba is a ward of the great Republic, and that from an economic point of view she is absolutely dependent upon the markets of this country, and that she can not prosper, or at least not in any very high degree, unless she receives either freedom of trade or less restrictions than are imposed upon other countries. So I insist upon it that I was warranted in saying that the Republic of Cuba is dependent, both in a political and an economic sense, upon this country.

Now, I was charged, and charged by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], I believe, with disturbing conditions, with making statements that would affect the credit of Cuba, and that, too, at a most critical time. Mr. President, I claim to be the friend of Cuba. I would not do a thing or say a word which would throw any obstacle whatever in the path of her progress. I contend that in presenting the dependent condition of Cuba, both in a political and an economic sense, I was simply stating the facts of history—facts testified to in the records of both bodies of Congress, facts testified to by the Cuban delegation, and facts proclaimed by the Republican Members of the House in their speeches.

I claim that the very purpose of the joint resolution which I have introduced is to improve the credit of Cuba. As a matter of fact, Cuba is to-day attempting to negotiate bonds to the extent of \$35,000,000, with interest at the rate of 5 per cent, and the bonds are offered at a discount of 10 per cent. It is a matter well known throughout the financial world that thus far there have been no takers for the bonds.

The suggestion of the joint resolution is that those bonds shall be guaranteed by the United States, which would enable them to be negotiated at par. Such a guaranty would warrant a reduction of the rate of interest from 5 per cent to 3 per cent. This would effect an immediate saving of three million and a half of dollars in the negotiation of the bonds and an ultimate saving in interest which would very nearly pay the principal of the bonds themselves. So I contend that the passage of the joint resolution would strengthen the credit of Cuba and not injure it.

In support of what I have said, I should like to append to my remarks certain quotations from the proceedings before the Ways and Means Committee of the House, the testimony of Colonel Bliss, Mr. Mendoza, and others representing Cuba, and also certain quotations from debates upon this subject. I will not read them now, but I ask permission of the Senate to insert them in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, such will be the order of the Senate. The Chair hears none.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, briefly stated, the purpose of the joint resolution is not force or compulsion. The appeal is only to reason. We invite Cuba to become a State of the Union upon an equality with all the other States of the Union, and we suggest, simply as steps leading in that direction, that the President, the judicial officers, and the legislative body of that Republic shall become the executive officers, the judicial officers, and the legislative officers of the State of Cuba without change of term or salary.

As to the customs and postal officials, the joint resolution suggests that they shall become incorporated into the customs and postal service of the United States. As to the small army of that Republic, the rural guards, composed mainly of and officered by soldiers who fought in the war for Cuban freedom, the suggestion is that it shall be incorporated into the Army of the United States. As to the debt, the suggestion is that the bonds shall be guaranteed by the United States, and thus Cuba will ultimately save in expenditures a sum aggregating nearly \$40,000,000.

Such are the suggestions contained in this resolution of little changes in government that are necessary to adapt the Republic of Cuba to statehood in the American Union. Such is the immediate economic advantage which Cuba would secure by union, in addition to the great economic advantage of having her entire sugar crop, amounting to 1,000,000 tons annually, admitted to this country without the imposition of the present duty of \$35 a ton, thus enabling the Cubans to secure in the American market, for the present production of 1,000,000 tons, \$75,000,000 instead of \$40,000,000. That would be a saving to Cuba of \$35,000,000 annually, \$350,000,000 in ten years, over a billion dollars in the forty years constituting the term of the bonds which she is about to issue.

Now, I submit this statement simply in explanation. The joint resolution came up unexpectedly the other day for discussion, and I was unable to answer all of the Senators who spoke upon it. My purpose now is not to make a speech, but simply to complete

the record, so that there can be no misapprehension whatever as to the purpose and intent of the joint resolution.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I do not intend to discuss the propriety of a political union between the United States and Cuba. I may do that on this resolution before it is disposed of.

But I wish to enter my protest here against the assertion of the Senator from Nevada, made as if he thought it was unquestioned by anybody else, that Cuba is a political dependency of the United States. That is being reported all over the country as an excuse for this proposed legislation, on which I am not going to speak now, but I shall do so later. There is not an international lawyer in the world who will risk his reputation by saying that there is the slightest foundation for asserting that Cuba is a dependency of the United States. That, if I may be allowed to use the term without offense, is an absolute legal absurdity.

We asked them to do certain things in what is called the Platt resolution. I opposed those resolutions; but I stated then as a lawyer, and as a lawyer who has given some attention to international law, that there was no excuse for saying that the passage of the Platt resolution would interfere in the slightest degree with their sovereignty. My objections were on other grounds.

We made a treaty with Cuba. We do not make treaties with dependencies, if we have any. I suppose we have some now in these days; but no nation makes treaties with its dependencies. The very fact that the United States made a treaty with Cuba was a declaration to the world that that is a sovereign power.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] has said that he intends to speak on this subject, and I understand that he intends to speak particularly to that point. I am not going to detain the Senate now. I wanted simply to enter this protest. Cuba is as much a sovereign power as the United States. Try the question by international law and Cuba is as much a sovereign power as Great Britain. She has as much right to make a reciprocity treaty with Great Britain to-day that shall be in Great Britain's favor and against us as she has to make this treaty with us. She can utterly ignore us and decline to carry out the Platt resolution if she sees fit. All she would have to do would be to amend her constitution. But the fact is that the things put in the Platt resolution are undoubtedly for her benefit, and the President of the Republic so declared the other day in his message. They would not part, and why should they, with some of the features incorporated in their constitution with our consent, as when we said "we will help you maintain your sovereignty if anybody attacks you." The President of the Cuban Republic said the other day that those things are of great value.

I hope the next time anyone asserts that Cuba is not an independent power he will bring us something to show that it is not, to show that they lack some element of sovereignty. This they deny, and I deny it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado certainly misunderstood me if he understood me to say that Cuba is a dependency of the United States. I think there is a distinction between saying that Cuba is a dependency of the United States and saying that Cuba is in some respects, and in many respects, dependent upon the United States. Now, all I contend is that there is an economic point of view—

Mr. TELLER. Let me interrupt the Senator. The Senator said she is a dependency upon us, economically and politically, as I understood him. Now, if he modifies that statement I will only say I will have my remarks apply to some things others have said, particularly in another place, but I shall not speak to-day.

Mr. NEWLANDS. That I may not be misunderstood, I will say I do contend that while Cuba is a sovereign State, and has all the attributes of sovereignty, her sovereignty has been in some measure curtailed—

Mr. TELLER. Not at all.

Mr. NEWLANDS. By the Platt amendment.

Mr. TELLER. Not at all.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly when the sovereign power of a state to contract a debt is curtailed by her constitution, and another state is called upon to determine whether or not the exercise of that power is reasonable or proper, her sovereignty is curtailed in some degree.

Mr. TELLER. Not at all.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I do not see how it can be otherwise.

Mr. TELLER. I do not propose to discuss that question now. I simply want to assert that her sovereignty is in no wise impaired by what she puts in her own constitution.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the trouble and the mischief of this resolution is in its effect upon the new Republic, upon her Government, and her credit in the future.

The Senator from Nevada has gone into an elaborate reckoning of what would be the moneyed advantage to Cuba if she was annexed to the United States and saved a loan, saved the interest upon it, and became an integral part of the United States. The trouble is that all that is imaginary. Nobody expects—I do not

suppose the Senator from Nevada expects—that Cuba will be annexed and that we shall take Cuba. I do not think there are ten, perhaps not five Senators who are in favor of that. The mischief is that the agitation of the question, the starting of the subject by the Senator, disturbs Cuba, hurts her credit, and makes it more difficult for her as an independent Republic to negotiate the loan which she must negotiate, which arises from the situation and conditions before she became a Republic.

Like any power which has its origin and embryo in revolution, Cuba is confronted with the necessity of a loan to clear off all the obligations that rest upon her with reference to the building up and establishing her Republic; and every movement that is made here, every question that is raised, everything that involves a new scheme outside of the scheme of the Cuban Government which is going on, as has been said, peacefully and successfully, disturbs Cuba, disturbs her credit, makes it more difficult to negotiate her loan, makes it possible that she must negotiate it at lower rates; and then afterwards will come the question of assuming it. The question of annexation perhaps will never cease to be mooted here, and of the United States assuming the debt, and speculators getting the benefit of the difference.

That is why I object to the resolution, that it has nothing practical in its results. Hardly anybody is in favor of it, but it makes mischief simply by suggesting that there is something different from the present Government which is going on down there, and going on with a remarkable degree of success, that is better than that; and it weakens the hands of the patriotic men who are engaged, and faithfully and patriotically engaged, in the task of administering republican government down there.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, just a few words in reply to the Senator from Maine.

I claim that the suggestion of the possibility of Cuba becoming a State of the American Union will benefit her credit instead of injure it. But even under present conditions the people proposing to take those bonds would doubtless feel that the security of the bonds is strengthened by even the possibility of Cuba's becoming a State of the Union, and this suggestion should not in any way weaken the existing negotiations.

Now, as to the Senator's statement that no one is in favor of taking those islands, I agree with him that no one is in favor of taking the island of Cuba; at all events, I hope no one is in favor of it, for that suggests force and compulsion. But so far as the union of the island of Cuba with the American Union is concerned, I beg to differ with him. There has been no mode of getting an expression of the public sentiment either in Cuba or in this country upon that subject, but I submit that the traditional policy of this country, dating back a hundred years, has always included the acquisition of Cuba and the incorporation of Cuba into this Union if it could be done peaceably, with the consent of her people, and upon terms of equality to both. I believe that the sentiment has been and is to-day favorable in Cuba itself, though that sentiment has found no expression, for they have been discouraged, perhaps, in their aspirations by the new policy of the American Republic, which has looked to the acquisition of territory as a dependent territory subject to the absolute will of the sovereign owner; and they doubtless fear that if they make overtures for union with this country those overtures might be met by measures smacking somewhat of compulsion or violence and leading to the annexation of the island as a military dependency or as a colonial possession of the United States.

Now, to support my statement that there is a sentiment in Cuba favorable to the union, let me read from the testimony of General Bliss (then Colonel Bliss), a distinguished American officer who had been serving in Cuba for three years as administrator or collector of customs during the American occupation, who was fully familiar with its people and with its economic conditions, and who testified with great clearness and precision before the Committee on Ways and Means two years ago. The quotation is a short one. His statement was in reply to a question presented by myself:

Mr. NEWLANDS. As I understand it, Colonel, the Cuban people wish to come into commercial union with the United States without being subjected to the burdens that political union would involve, such as exclusion of the pauper labor of Europe and restriction of Asiatic immigration. The contention, you understand, on the American side, in behalf of the beet-sugar industry and others, is that it would be unfair to have a commercial union when the Americans are handicapped by restrictive legislation as to immigration and cheap labor, and the Cubans are not.

A GENTLEMAN. And the payment of internal taxes.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Now, I ask you whether or not the Cuban people are prepared to come into political union with the United States so that they will stand upon an equality in the production of sugar?

Colonel BLISS. I think, judging from my own personal acquaintance and from information derived from it, that the great majority of Cubans are ready.

Mr. NEWLANDS. They are ready to come into political union?

Colonel BLISS. Yes, sir.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Do you mean by that that they are willing to come in as a part of the United States under a Territorial form of government under the Constitution, their people being citizens, and wait until the United States

is ready to admit Cuba to statehood, or do you mean that they would require immediate statehood?

Colonel BLISS. From all those people who are interested in any way personally in the island of Cuba I have never heard but one statement—that they would be glad to come in as a Territory, as a colony, or remain under the present military administration, or in any way so as to become recognized as a part of the United States.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Now, then, if the United States Government, in the place of tariff concessions, should, by joint resolution adopted by Congress, invite Cuba to come into our political union, first as a Territory, with the assurance that in due time she would be admitted to statehood, do you think that invitation would be accepted by Cuba?

Colonel BLISS. I think it would; yes, sir.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Colonel, do you think the Cuban climate is adapted to Americans?

Colonel BLISS. Yes, sir; perfectly.

Mr. NEWLANDS. That they can live there generation after generation without degeneration?

Colonel BLISS. I can not answer you further than my own generation, and, in fact, not for all of that one. I have lived there three years, and have worked hard in all the variations of climate that they have there. I feel as well now as I did when I went there, and I see no reason to think that if I were there twenty-five years longer it would make any difference.

Mr. NEWLANDS. You were speaking a few moments ago regarding the sentiment there as to political union with the United States. Do you derive that sentiment from communications with Spaniards, or from communication with Cubans?

Colonel BLISS. With Spaniards, with Cubans, with laboring men, and with everybody except a certain class of Cuban politicians.

Mr. NEWLANDS. That is a small class, is it?

Colonel BLISS. Comparatively a small class; yes, sir.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Take the leaders in the late war with Spain—the Cuban leaders—what is their sentiment regarding it?

Colonel BLISS. I think that, as a matter of pride, at least, all of those men would prefer to see an independent Cuba. I think—in fact, I know—that there are some of these who have no hesitation in saying that after the pride of their people has been satisfied they will gladly welcome the next step in the solution of this problem.

Mr. NEWLANDS. As a permanent arrangement, do you think they would prefer simply a commercial union with this country, with tariff concessions on both sides, or political union, which, of course, would involve complete commercial union?

Colonel BLISS. That I do not know, sir; but I am satisfied that in bringing about this commercial union of which you speak, any condition that you choose to impose will be gladly accepted; any modification in any law, or the creation of any new law, will be gladly made by Cuba to secure that which is all she asks now, I believe, viz, closer commercial relations with the United States.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Do you think their disposition as to a political union with this country arises from these commercial considerations; or do other considerations enter into it?

Colonel BLISS. I think it all grows out of the commercial considerations.

Mr. NEWLANDS. It is represented here that there is intense hostility upon the part of Cubans to America.

Colonel BLISS. There is on the part of a certain outspoken element; yes, sir.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Is that a large proportion?

Colonel BLISS. I think it is a very small proportion, largely represented by the political men of whom I speak, whose immediate hope for the gratification of their pride and their ambition is in the establishment of an independent government.

Mr. NEWLANDS. You have spoken of the American influx that would follow settled conditions there. Do you think Americans there would take hold of the soil and till it? Do you think they would take up small holdings there?

Colonel BLISS. Oh, yes, sir.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Is that climate adapted for Americans in that kind of work?

Colonel BLISS. Perfectly; perfectly. It is warmer in winter and cooler in summer than almost any part of the United States with which I am familiar. I do not know of a more delightful climate, winter and summer, than the island of Cuba, so far as concerns any part of the island that I have visited. Of course, the effect that would be produced on a second generation or a third generation is something that I do not know and can not foresee; but I am acquainted with many Americans, Englishmen, Germans, Frenchmen, and Spaniards who have lived in Cuba from a quarter to a half a century and who have suffered no deterioration that I can see, either physical or otherwise. I know a good many Americans, small planters, people who have come down and bought 30, 40, or 50 acres of land and are raising vegetables and oranges, who have found that the business is not successful because they can not export anything to the United States. They find that the price they get for a barrel of oranges on the wharves of Habana is counterbalanced by the duty they have to pay in New York.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Do these Americans labor themselves or do they employ peon labor?

Colonel BLISS. Oh, those whom I have in mind are people that go out and work in the fields themselves.

Cuba was also represented by a delegation there, called, I believe, the Cuban Economic Delegation, representing its business and commercial interests, a number of men of great intelligence, who presented their views to the committee on our trade relations with Cuba. One of them, Mr. Mendoza, a leader among them, designated in the report as Cuban commissioner on economic affairs, was asked by me the following question; and remember that the question asked of Colonel Bliss was in the presence of this delegation:

Mr. NEWLANDS. Now, Mr. Mendoza, you heard Colonel Bliss's statement regarding the sentiment there as to political union with this country, or annexation?

Mr. MENDOZA. Yes, sir; I quite agree with him.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Do you agree with him?

Mr. MENDOZA. Yes, sir.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Does he express fairly the sentiment of Cuba?

Mr. MENDOZA. Yes, sir.

Mr. NEWLANDS. And of the Cuban people?

Mr. MENDOZA. Except politicians and that class of people.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Do they form a very large and influential class there?

Mr. MENDOZA. Well, I do not think they do, because all those people together do not own much money. [Laughter.]

Mr. McCLELLAN. They are not like our politicians, then?

Mr. MENDOZA. No; they are not like our politicians. [Laughter.]

Here you have the statements of Colonel Bliss, who was familiar with all the affairs of Cuba, and of Mr. Mendoza, representing this Cuban delegation, and I say here that every member of that delegation nodded his approval when Mr. Mendoza gave his approbation to Colonel Bliss's statement.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Maine is probably right when he suggests that the resolution of my friend from Nevada may send a thrill of alarm through the island of Cuba. But that is not the fault of the Senator from Nevada, and it is not the fault of the resolution he has offered. There is nothing in that resolution which of itself need alarm the people of Cuba. If they are alarmed at all it is because of certain recent performances of the executive department in using the Navy of the United States to forward a conspiracy on the part of a syndicate of French adventurers to dismember an American Republic. That of itself, I have no doubt, has alarmed all American countries who feel that they are at the mercy of the United States, and has made them unusually suspicious of anything that we may do or suggest. Therefore, and for that reason only, the resolution offered by the Senator from Nevada may cause alarm in the island of Cuba.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After ten minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, November 27, 1903, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 25, 1903.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

Midshipman George B. Landenberger to be an ensign in the Navy from the 15th day of April, 1903, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade on that date.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES—INFANTRY ARM.

First Lieut. Henry S. Wygant, Third Infantry, to be captain, October 9, 1903, vice Campbell, Twenty-second Infantry, retired from active service.

First Lieut. James M. Graham, Nineteenth Infantry, to be captain, October 10, 1903, vice Ord, Twenty-seventh Infantry, retired from active service.

DISTRICT JUDGE.

John C. Pollock, of Kansas, to be United States district judge for the district of Kansas, vice William C. Hook, appointed United States circuit judge for the eighth judicial circuit.

JUDGES OF POLICE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Ivory G. Kimball, of the District of Columbia, to be judge of the police court of the District of Columbia. A reappointment, his term expiring January 13, 1904.

Charles Fletcher Scott, of the District of Columbia, to be judge of the police court of the District of Columbia. A reappointment, his term expiring January 9, 1904.

POSTMASTERS.

CONNECTICUT.

James F. Holden to be postmaster at Forestville, in the county of Hartford and State of Connecticut. Office became Presidential July 1, 1903.

IOWA.

A. M. Henderson to be postmaster at Story City, in the county of Story and State of Iowa, in place of William A. Kelley, resigned.

KANSAS.

Albert M. Wasser to be postmaster at Girard, in the county of Crawford and State of Kansas, in place of Albert M. Wasser. Incumbent's commission expires December 12, 1903.

KENTUCKY.

Charles E. Mann to be postmaster at Pembroke, in the county of Christian and State of Kentucky. Office became Presidential April 1, 1903.

MICHIGAN.

Hutson B. Colman to be postmaster at Kalamazoo, in the county of Kalamazoo and State of Michigan, in place of Hutson B. Colman. Incumbent's commission expires December 13, 1903.

MONTANA.

Daniel H. Ross to be postmaster at Missoula, in the county of Missoula and State of Montana, in place of George K. Keep. Incumbent's commission expires December 12, 1903.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

George A. Young to be postmaster at Concord, in the county of Merrimack and State of New Hampshire, in place of Henry Robinson. Incumbent's commission expires December 13, 1903.

NEW JERSEY.

Lewis A. Waters to be postmaster at Madison, in the county of Morris and State of New Jersey, in place of William H. Larison, removed.

OHIO.

Wilbur W. Templin to be postmaster at Calla, in the county of Mahoning and State of Ohio, in place of Alfred H. McCline. Incumbent's commission expires December 12, 1903.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Simon Beckham to be postmaster at Hartsville, in the county of Darlington and State of South Carolina. Office became Presidential October 1, 1903.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 24, 1903.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

To be assistant surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 7th day of June, 1900.

Thomas McC. Lippitt.
Barton L. Wright.
Ralph W. Plummer.
Henry E. Odell.
James S. Taylor.
Joseph A. Murphy.
John T. Kennedy.
Karl Ohnesorg.
Charles N. Fiske.

POSTMASTERS.

GEORGIA.

Ransom A. Brinson to be postmaster at Millen, in the county of Screven and State of Georgia.

NEW YORK.

James H. Callanan to be postmaster at Schenectady, in the county of Schenectady and State of New York.

PENNSYLVANIA.

David Reynolds, sr., to be postmaster at Ford City, in the county of Armstrong and State of Pennsylvania.

LIGHT AND HARBOR DUES IN ZANZIBAR.

On November 25, 1903, the Senate ratified, and the injunction of secrecy was removed from, a treaty signed on June 5, 1903, between the United States and Great Britain, acting in the name of the Sultan of Zanzibar, amending the treaty of amity and commerce concluded September 21, 1833, between the United States and the Sultan of Muscat, so as to permit the imposition of light and harbor dues on vessels of the United States entering the ports of Zanzibar and Pemba.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, November 27, 1903.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. F. J. PRETTYMAN.

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday last was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN) presented a petition of the Ohio State Bar Association, praying that Put in Bay, in that State, be selected as the site for the proposed new naval training station on the Great Lakes; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Clearwater, Kans., and a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Clearwater Harbor, Fla., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington presented petitions of the congregation of the Methodist Church of Walla Walla, of the Epworth League of Bay View, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Bay View, of sundry citizens of Bay View, and of the Ladies' Aid Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Clarksonton, all in the State of Washington, praying for an investigation